

Remarks

In response to the Final Office Action mailed May 7, 2004, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections and that the case pass to issue in light of the remarks below. Claims 1-17 are pending, and no claims have been added, canceled, or amended by this paper.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S.P.N. 6,404,876 to Smith et al. (hereinafter the Smith patent). The Applicants respectfully submit that the Smith patent fails to disclose each limitation of the claimed invention. In particular, the Smith patent fails to disclose an intelligence service peripheral for determining a type of directory assistance requested, which directs a call through a telecommunications network to a call center if the caller is not requesting business directory assistance and that automatically determines at least one telephone number satisfying the caller request without communication through the call routing telecommunications network by searching in a directory database associated with the intelligence service peripheral if the caller is requesting business directing assistance, thereby limiting use of the call routing telecommunications network.

The Examiner, however, asserts that the Smith patent does disclose the above-identified features. In particular, the Examiner cites to Column 8, line 7-30, of the Smith patent in support thereof. This portion of the Smith patent is reproduced below.

Once the call is received by CVD SN/SCP 11 at matrix switch 7 through inbound T15, IPC Host 8 directs RP 9 to analyze the voice patterns of utterances spoken by calling party 1 against data stored in, or otherwise accessible to IPC Host 8. The goal of this analysis is to make a match to the identity of terminating party 2 using voice information provided by calling party 1 in combination with Automated Speech Recognition (ASR) techniques. This analysis may involve one or more levels of sophistication as described in further detail herein. For example, calling party 1 may simply give the name of the terminating party 2, in which case the analysis would require straight matching against stored data. In another example,

calling party 1 may have to make one or more choices against other stored data before the desired terminating party 2 can be identified.


IPC Host 8 also contains, or has access to, further intelligence in which calling party 1's voice information may be matched with more precision to identify desired terminating party 2. As described in more detail herein, this intelligence may include accent or language matching features, regional and national terminating party subsets based on ANI or other call origin identifier, and predicted likely terminating parties based on historical calling patterns.

As described above, the Smith patent failed to disclose differentiating between business and nonbusiness requests for directory assistance. Accordingly, the Smith patent fails to disclose each limitation recited in independent claims 1, 9, and 10 of the Applicant's invention. Consequently, each independent claim and the dependent claims which depend therefrom are patentable and nonobvious over the Smith patent.

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully submit that each rejection has been fully replied to and traversed and that the case is in condition to pass to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if it would further prosecution of this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

ELIOT M. CASE

By 
John R. Buser
Reg. No. 51,517
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: 7-29-04

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351